UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,199	08/01/2001	Klaus Hofrichter	80398.P455	6066
Florin Corie	7590 06/14/201	EXAMINER		
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard			CASLER, TRACI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Los Angeles, C	A 90025-1026	3629		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/14/2010	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/921,199	HOFRICHTER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Traci L. Casler	3629	

	Traci L. Casler	3629	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATI	ON IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWA	NCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07()	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in between the content of the cont	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c			10 100000 101
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li> <li>13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Traci L Casler/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3629	

Continuation of 13. Other: The applicant makes arguments regarding previously amended limitation of "tranmsitting to the server, a request that the client is to be identified in the list of the plurality of content providers as an additional content provider that provides the content file". The applicant first makes the argment with respect to the 112 1st rejection that the disclosure supports this limitation because the "request" is made when the request is submitts a request for the distribution tool. However, as claimed the limitation presents the "request" to be added to the list after the distribution tool has been appliend to the requestor. This leads one to believe reading the claims that the request to be added to the list of cotnent providers is separate from the request from the distribution tool. As currently claimed the claims make it appear as not all clients are put on the content provider list unless they request to be added to the list, therefore you can have content providers who are not on the provider list. However, this interpretation is not supported by the applicants disclosure nore is it supported by applicants arguments which state that when they request the distribution tool they are requesting to be added to the content provider list. When reading applicants arguments and disclosure one is lead to believe that anyone who received the distribution tool(via a request) are automically added to the content provider list. As such the limitations are taught by the prior art of record.